UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/535,292	05/17/2005	Jurgen Weese	DE 020269	5985	
24737 7590 11/26/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 PRIA DCLUTE MANOR NY 10510			EXAMINER		
			CHU, DAVID H		
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2628			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/26/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/535,292	WEESE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	DAVID II. CITO	2020	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 20 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following a application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidaveal (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	it, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Anno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI ').	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present of the present			he issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	I sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under apper and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Kee M Tung/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2628			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues reference Shen does not determine the values of the second volume image that are relevant based on the relevant voxels of the first volume image or on neighbors of the relevant voxels of the first volume image. Further, the Applicant argues that Shen subtracts the first and second volume images to determine which voxels have changed in the second volume image. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The differential file is first obtained through a one time simulation. It is from this extracted differential file that the ray caster and pixel calculator carries out the dynamic rendering process ("Visualization Pipeline", pg. 181-182). Clearly as presented in the previous office action, the differential file contains the "determined" information need for efficient volume rendering. The Applicant argues that the extracting process differs from the invention. However, The Examiner states that it is the pipeline process of utilizing the once extracted "determined" information (differential file) is the equivalent to the limitation as claimed by the Applicant.